

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES
2
3
4
5
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 T-MOBILE USA, INC.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

15 Case No. C14-1351-RAJ

16 ORDER

17
18 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendant Huawei Device USA, Inc.'s
19 ("Huawei USA") Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law. Dkt. # 469. The Court finds
20 that no response from Plaintiff T-Mobile USA, Inc. ("T-Mobile") is necessary for the
21 purpose of resolving Huawei USA's motion.

22 Rule 50(a) provides, "[i]f a party has been fully heard on an issue during a jury
23 trial and the court finds that a reasonable jury would not have a legally sufficient
24 evidentiary basis to find for the party on that issue, the court may: (A) resolve the issue
25 against the party; and (B) grant a motion for judgment as a matter of law against the party
on a claim or defense that, under the controlling law, can be maintained or defeated only
with a favorable finding on that issue." Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(a)(1). In applying Rule 50(a),
the Court "must view the evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party . . .
and draw all reasonable inferences in that party's favor." *Ostad v. Oregon Health Scis.*
Univ., 327 F.3d 876, 881 (9th Cir. 2003). "A motion for a judgment as a matter of law is

26
27
28 ORDER – 1

1 properly granted only if no reasonable juror could find in the non-moving party's favor."

2 *El-Hakem v. BZY Inc.*, 415 F.3d 1068, 1072 (9th Cir. 2005).

3 As the non-moving party, T-Mobile is entitled to all reasonable inferences and for
4 the Court to view the evidence in the light most favorable to it. Applying this standard,
5 and having reviewed Huawei USA's motion and the applicable law, and being familiar
6 with the relevant portions of the trial record, the Court concludes that a reasonable jury
7 would have a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for T-Mobile on the issues that
8 Huawei USA raises in its motion. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Huawei USA's
9 motion. Dkt. # 469.

10 DATED this 14th day of May, 2017.

11 
12 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
13 United States District Judge